



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the Roman Church, and the other churches in communion with her, which you here seemingly admit to be the true Church of Christ." We spoke plainly, and evidently of the whole church, and our correspondent says, "of course, you mean a part only!"

Now, this is really very unfair, and it is hard to argue on such terms. But we are quite sure our correspondent meant no unfairness. The fact is, Roman Catholics are so drilled into the habit of taking a part for the whole themselves, that they think every one else must do so too. But it really is time for them to look at this great fact, that the Greek and Eastern Churches are really existing, though not in communion with Rome, that they are, perhaps, equal to her in numbers, some of them superior in antiquity, and all of them superior to her in having preserved the Catholic creed without mixture or addition. It is time for them to learn that a part is not the whole.

We trust, we have clearly answered the question as to the visibility of the Church. We have nothing to add, except that we do not think that perseverance in error, when it has once crept in, is necessary to the succession or continuance of a church. On this ground we hold that the present Church of England and Ireland is the same church that existed in these countries before the Reformation; the succession of bishops, clergy, and people professing the same creed, having been then continued, and nothing done but the removal of errors which had crept in.

Now for the only question that really arises out of the case of Berengarius. Are individuals, clergy or laymen, bound to profess anything or everything that any bishop, or any number of bishops may choose to dictate to them? This is really the question that arises out of the case of Berengarius; it is a question of the infallibility, not of the visibility of the Church. To this we answer, that persons are not so bound to receive everything that bishops may propose to them. But, we do not, on the other hand, adopt the alternative offered to us by Philalethes, that every one is to follow "his own peculiar whims and fancies." A line must be drawn somewhere; this is the way we draw the line; all Christian people are bound to follow the prelates and clergy of the Church, in that faith which Christ and his Apostles delivered to the Church; but if prelates and clergy require people to believe other articles of faith besides what Christ and his Apostles delivered to the Church, then we are bound to refuse to adopt such things as our faith. Does Philalethes deny or adopt this rule? Does he believe everything that every pope or bishop, or council has said? If we do, we promise him a nice collection. If he do not, can he draw the line better than we have drawn it?

We said, and say again, that, Matthew xviii. 17, "to hear the Church," applies only to offences of one man against another; we say so, because our Saviour said so; for he expressly gives that direction to meet this case, and this only—"If thy brother shall offend against thee"—(v. 15, Douay Bible). But Philalethes says of it "much more I argue," should the Church govern men's faith; but his arguments are not Christ's words; and we must beg leave to take that passage simply as Christ spoke and applied it. The other passage he quotes—"Obey your prelates" (Hebrews xiii. 17.) is more to the purpose. We accept that passage as binding us to obey prelates, declaring to us the faith which Christ and his Apostles gave. The same Apostle who gave us that precept has told us also—"Be ye followers of me as I also am of Christ"—1 Cor. xi. 1. But he has told us also—"Though we, or an angel from heaven, were to preach a Gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema"—Gal. i. 8. We do not understand St. Paul's precept—"Obey your prelates," as giving those prelates a higher power over our faith, than St. Paul claimed for himself; we, therefore, think that we are to follow prelates "as they follow Christ"—that is, in all things in which they follow him; but if any prelates should preach other doctrine to us, than Christ delivered to his Church, we are to count those prelates anathema.

But one clear case in which Philalethes himself must say that a pope and a council required a man to profess what no Catholic can or ought to believe, will, perhaps, have as much weight as many arguments. Such a case we have at hand; it is the case of Berengarius, which he brings up to us. We have before us the recantation which Pope Nicholas and his council compelled Berengarius to sign. That recantation was put into the canon law, and we quote it from the canon law, so there is no mistake—Decret. de consecrat. Dist. ii. c. 42. It runs thus:—"The true Body and Blood of Christ is said to be 'in a sensible manner' (sensualiter) handled by the hands of the priest, broken, and ground by the teeth of the faithful." Now the only possible meaning that can be given to the word "sensualiter" is this: that the Body of Christ is handled, broken, and eaten, in a way that our senses can judge of and perceive; that it becomes the object of the senses; in other words, that the priest knows by the feel, and those who eat know by the taste, that it is the true Body of Christ! Yet, if Philalethes ask any Roman Catholic priest or bishop now whether this doctrine be true, that our senses can discern the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament, he will be told that this is downright heresy, and not the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church; for that our senses can perceive nothing but the accidents of bread and wine; and cannot perceive the body and blood of Christ at all; and that it is heresy to say

that the body and blood are in the bread and wine "sensualiter," or in a way that our senses can perceive.

Yet this is the doctrine that Pope Nicholas and the Council compelled Berengarius to subscribe!

We are not the first to discover that the plain sense of this recantation is not only contrary to our senses, but is heretical according to the Church of Rome itself. We have said that this recantation stands in the Canon Law, into which Gratian put it. The authorised editions of that law have generally printed with them a commentary called "the gloss," and the gloss says of these words of the recantation—"Nisi sane intelligas verba Berengarii, in majorem incidis heresin quam ipse habuit;" that is, "unless you understand the words of Berengarius in a sound sense, you will fall into a greater heresy than his"! Admitting that the natural and obvious meaning of these words is heresy; and showing that these words must be twisted some way to get rid of the heresy. But there is no way of doing it; the words have one meaning only, and can have no other; that meaning is heresy in the Church of Rome itself!

The fact is, that Pope Nicholas and his council were mere bunglers; they did not rightly understand the Popish doctrine; and it was hard for them, for that doctrine was not settled until afterwards; and hence the difficulty that later authorities found in taking their words "in a sound sense."

Poor "Weathercock Berengarius, who abjured and relapsed so often!" They made him a weathercock indeed; it would have needed the true spirit of a martyr, of a Jerome or a Huss, a Ridley or a Latimer, to have come through that trial; and he had it not. Yet we feel great compassion for those whom the Church of Rome in her palmy days made "weathercocks"; for we know that in her mercy she gave them their choice, either to be "weathercocks" or martyrs.

ON PURGATORY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Permit me to say, that you should first have shown, from unexceptionable authority, the Catholic Church of the third, fourth, fifth, sixth, or even of succeeding centuries, that my citations from Origen are heretical, and have been formally condemned; and when you give this proof you may then call upon me to prove, from orthodox writers of the first three centuries, the doctrine of purgatory. This proof I have, more than once before, called for, yet you have not attempted to give anything of more weight than your own opinion. Mere assertion is the only authority you oppose to these citations; and this, however respectable the party, falls far short of a definitive proof. The doctrine of purgatory remains untouched and unscathed; you have not yet disproved it: these are the real features of the case at present. Do not be tardy in bringing forth the requisite proofs, and the Catholics of the world will bless you for the enlightenment. You tell me to own that the Church, in the days of St. Epiphanius, had defined nothing on the subject of purgatory. I confess; and when you show the heterodoxy of my citations from Origen, I will prove that the Church long before that time taught the efficacy of prayers for the dead, and the remission of sins in the world to come. This you do not deny to be the belief in the time of Pope Gregory the Great. Let me now ask you, can a definition confer being or vitality? Or does nothing really exist but what has already been defined? Your charge, whereby you impute heresy to St. Augustine, is novel and startling. This is a light which the ancient Church had not, and which could not be found in any save in a very modern Church. This is truly a summary mode of disposing of an adversary, whose evidence is otherwise incontrovertible. You must also charge St. Epiphanius with innovation, or admit the distinction he makes between prayers for the saints and prayers for sinners: the former were decidedly and unmistakably thanksgivings, and the latter propitiations; and this fact, together with the cultus of the saints, is unequivocally set forth in the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, from which you attempt to prove the contrary. First—"By the intercession of the most holy, immaculate, blessed above all, our glorious lady, Mother of God, and ever Virgin Mary, by the virtue of the glorious and vivifying cross, and of all the saints, may Christ, our true God, have mercy on us."—*Goar*, page 63. This extract contains very important evidence in favour of the cultus of saints (but this apart), with a verification of the distinction recognised by St. Epiphanius.

Again—"It is truly meet to praise thee, Mother of God, who art always to be blest, to be venerated above the cherubim, and incomparably more glorious than the seraphim, who, in all purity, didst bring forth God, the Word; we magnify thee, who art truly the Mother of God. Perfect us, O God, by the prayers of St. John the prophet, precursor, and Baptist, of the saint whose memory we celebrate, and of all the saints; and be mindful of all who have slept before us in the hope of the resurrection to eternal life."—*Ibid*.

Here we see whether praying to saints was an improvement of an age later than the fifth century, or not; and we also find, that God was supplicated, through them, for mercy on the souls of those who were already departed.

These passages afford palpable evidence that the Apostles, the Virgin Mary, the saints, &c., were not prayed for indiscriminately with the other dead, and that the prayers

and offerings made for them were only those of thanksgiving; for it could not be consistent with reason that the Apostles, Blessed Virgin, &c., should be prayed for in common with the other dead, in one part of the Liturgy, and be prayed to, as intercessors, in another part of it. I am most anxious to have the question of purgatory dispassionately and amicably discussed, with Christian and charitable feelings, free from all levity, and from that acrimony which so generally marks the temper of polemical disputants.

I remain, sir, yours sincerely,

EDMOND POWER.

We print the foregoing letter in courtesy to our correspondent, but we do not know that it requires any answer, since he has brought forward no new evidence or argument in support of purgatory. He tells us that we have not disproved it; but our business in this argument was not to disprove it—we were examining what evidence there was for it. We were content to waive for the present the argument that weighs most with Protestants, namely, the silence of Scripture about Purgatory; for Protestants cannot believe that if the Apostles knew that their converts had a prospect of undergoing torments after death, they would be justified, in common honesty, in concealing this from them, and in speaking as if their death was to be succeeded by an immediate entrance into happiness. But, omitting this point, we asked—Could the silence of Scripture be supplied by tradition, and can it be proved that purgatory was the doctrine of the primitive Church by the testimony of any orthodox writer for the first three hundred years? In answer to this question our correspondent has been able to produce nothing better than passages from Origen, which are branded as heretical by the Benedictine editors themselves, and which it is, therefore, not very unreasonable of us to decline to receive as orthodox sentiments. We pronounce, then, the doctrine of purgatory as still "Not Proven," and we think it is plain that if the Apostles and the early fathers had believed in it, it would have been easy to prove it from their writings.

We need not enter into a new subject—the worship of the saints—nor discuss the passages which Mr. Power has cited from the Liturgy which goes by the name of St. Chrysostom, out of which learned men are agreed did not, in its present shape, proceed from that Father. We quoted this liturgy merely in correction of the evasive expression that the saints "were named" in the prayers of the ancient Church, and to show that prayers were offered in plain words (explain it as you may) for them. Such prayer, we know to have been offered for the saints, from much earlier testimony. And it matters not that, in after times, prayers were offered through them and to them, unless it can be proved that these latter prayers were as ancient as the former. The fact, we believe, was, that in the times when men prayed for the saints they did not pray to them; and when they began to pray to them they left off praying for them.

ON A SACRIFICING PRIESTHOOD.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—It is evident that "Milner's End of Religious Controversy" has not put an end to controversy between the two contending Churches of Rome and of the Reformation. That astute theologian has charged the Church of England with inconsistency in having her ministers still called priests, while she has put away her altars, and pronounced the Sacrifice of the Mass to be a "Blasphemous fable and a dangerous deceit." And this charge would indeed fall with a crushing force upon the Church of England, if by "Priests" they meant sacrificers for sins, and not presbyters.

But the question is, which of the antagonist Churches, of Rome or England, is right in this matter? The ministers of the former are held to be a sacerdotal college, or caste, ordained to offer for sins; there is no doubt of that. And it is as clear, that the reformers of the latter protested against the idea of such an offering, offered oftentimes (for which cause they suffered death at the stake), and retained the word "Priest," as it had been handed down to them from the earliest ages, as the proper name of a "Minister of the New Covenant," which is rendered, in the authorized version of the Bible, uniformly, by the word "Elder." The controversy between the two Churches may now be brought to an issue at once, by the discussion of this one simple question, which I write this article to propose—namely, are the ministers of the New Testament (or Covenant) priests (*ιερευς*) apart from the people, to offer for sins? or to offer Christ again and again, for the sins of the quick and the dead? or are they not? Does the eternal and unchangeable high priesthood of the Son of God, who, having finished the work upon earth, which his Father gave him to do, ascended upon high, carrying with him the blood of the eternal Covenant, admit of such an idea, or leave any place in the Church upon earth for a successional atoning priesthood? To whom can they be successional? Not to Aaron, for his priesthood is defunct; and while it lasted, it made nothing perfect. Not, again, to Melchisedec, or to Christ, as his antitype; for that priesthood is absolutely *αναπαβατος*; and since he "sat down" on the right hand of God, no priest coming after him, until he comes again, has, or can have, any authority from God, or from his word, to stand at an altar upon earth, daily ministering. The veil is rent, and under a new and spiritual dispensation every Christian is a priest—